

exactly which bill we must pass. But, Mr. Speaker, we must have this debate, and we must not pass a placebo designed to make us feel like we have done something without doing something.

I hope senior citizens from around this country will look at this giant prescription bottle and say I am going to follow the example of that Member of Congress, I am going to send my Member my prescription medication bottles. I am going to send them the receipts and say, "Sir or Madam, what would you do if you were in my shoes, and what will you do as an elected Representative to solve this problem."

#### IN DEFENSE OF DR. LAURA SCHLESSINGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Americans must speak up for freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and traditional morality by defending Dr. Laura's TV show against politically correct antibigotry bigots. That is why I would like to read into the RECORD excerpts from an excellent column from the April 8 issue of World magazine by noted professor of journalism, Marvin Olasky. The article is entitled, "Support Dr. Laura: Don't back GLAAD, get mad at the anti-bigotry bigots."

Now I quote, "Long-time World readers know that I advocate political alliances between religious conservatives and libertarians, and social-issue alliances between biblical Christians and theologically conservative Jews and Muslims. We need such alliances, I believe, because God has not placed us in the ancient land of Canaan, the theme park that Israelites were told to make their own. Instead, Christians are called to live amid sin in a modern Babylon. . .

"Dr. Laura Schlessinger has reportedly surpassed Howard Stern and even Rush Limbaugh as the most-listened-to radio person. She regularly reaches over 20 million radio listeners on 450 stations in the United States and Canada with a message that emphasizes biblical morality. More Americans may soon hear that message: Paramount recently signed up 85 percent of U.S. television markets to air her hour-long talk format television show. But homosexual activists are now campaigning to stop her influence from expanding further. . .

"Dr. Laura (now 53 years old) has become an Orthodox Jew—and that means she has increasingly presented an Old Testament-based critique of homosexuality. To those who disagree she says, rightly, 'I am reiterating what God said. To them, that makes me

'hateful.' I'm sorry—talk to God about it.' Since groups like GLAAD, the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, don't want to talk to God about it, they have instead put pressure on Paramount to stop the Dr. Laura television show before it starts. GLAAD's posture is ironic in one respect; as Dr. Laura told our reporter Lynn Vincent earlier this year, 'I think it's quite fascinating that a group that's talking about civil rights wants to curtail my right to make a living, speak my point of view, and to have my religious convictions.'

"[www.stopdrlaura.com](http://www.stopdrlaura.com), one of the new attack websites, bills itself as 'a coalition against hate.' The Stop Dr. Laura movement lists e-mail addresses and phone and fax numbers for the Paramount offices, giving homosexuals and their apologists an easy way to maximize harassment of Paramount executives. One of the dot-com brains behind the attack, John Aravosis, said, 'The show's going to be canceled. This is going to be living hell for Paramount for the next year at least. E-mails will keep flying and flying and flying. Everyone on-line who's progressive is going to know that Paramount is a bigot.' For progressives, of course, 'bigotry' only goes one way.

"Former Member of Congress Pat Schroeder attacked Dr. Laura by saying, 'The pledge of allegiance says, 'with liberty and justice for all.' What part of 'all' is unclear?' That question should be turned back to Mrs. Schroeder. What about liberty for Dr. Laura.

"If the attack just came on the Web, it would not be so serious but leading liberal publications have become lapdogs of the homosexual lobby. GLAAD in 1998 met with editors of Time magazine to tutor them on the politically correct way to cover homosexuals in their publication. Time editors followed up obligingly with a flurry of pro-gay coverage, prompting GLAAD to trumpet the magazine's 'truly remarkable turnaround.' On March 20 Time had the predictable story, 'Dr. Laura, Heal Thyself.' So, for that matter, did Newsweek, with its standard hit-piece use of adjectives . . . and out-of-context references . . .

"Dr. Laura issued an ironic statement: 'We are all made in God's image, and therefore, we should treat one another with love and kindness.' But for activists, sincere overtures of peace will not suffice, and only Dr. Laura's unconditional surrender is acceptable . . .

"If a person of Dr. Laura's prominence and proven appeal can be kept off television, tyrants have seized control of the airways and no one who doesn't bow to political correctness is safe . . .

"The best way to ask Paramount executives not to be swayed by the GLAAD offensive is to send a letter to Mr. Frank Kelly, Paramount Tele-

vision, 5555 Melrose Avenue, Hollywood, California 90038, or an e-mail to [television@pde.paramount.com](mailto:television@pde.paramount.com)."

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise in support of Dr. Laura.

#### THE REUNIFICATION OF THE PARTHENON MARBLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an issue of great importance to our Nation and to the international cultural community. I was tremendously pleased to learn that the matter of the Elgin Marbles is now being considered by the British Parliament and would like to offer my support for all efforts by the committee to conduct a thorough, authoritative examination of all the issues of return of the Parthenon Sculptures to the Acropolis.

The House of Commons, committee on Culture, Media and Sport will be examining the issue of the Reunification of the Parthenon Marbles as a part of its present Inquiry On Cultural Property: Return and Illicit Trade. Last week, the committee traveled to Athens to conduct on-site meetings on the issue with the Hellenic Republic.

The Parthenon was built nearly 2,500 years ago by the original Periclean democracy. The Parthenon Marbles are the segments of the Parthenon temple frieze and structures removed by Lord Elgin from the Parthenon Temple in Athens to London in 1801 to 1816 under the circumstances of debatable legality.

The subject of the Parthenon Marbles is not a Greek-British issue but one of international and U.S. interests. Within the international community, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, UNESCO, and the European Parliament have issued declarations urging that the Marbles be returned to Greece. From the major government buildings of all Western democracies to the emblem of UNESCO, the Parthenon is the recognized international symbol of culture and democracy.

Within Great Britain, two polls over the last 2 years demonstrated that the British public favors the reunification of the Marbles. Last year, an Early Day Motion, signed by 112 members of the British Parliament, was presented urging the return of the Marbles. In March, the Economist magazine published a definitive article on the issue including its own poll of Parliament showing very significant support for the return of the Marbles.

No modern legal concepts of cultural properties apply to the case of the Parthenon Marbles because of the following tragic coincidence. The removal of the Parthenon Marbles occurred on

the eve of all modern treaties and international legal precepts regarding cultural property, even in the same decades that the Allies in Europe broke historic ground when they returned the cultural property seized by Napoleon to the Nations of origin. The committee will need to apply strict interpretation of its own legal principles as it weighs the rights of the possessor against the rights of the creator, a very important principle.

The return of the Parthenon Marbles would raise no cause for concern for any other world museums, especially in the United States. Additionally, the Parthenon Marbles is unique, and their reunification would not create a precedent for other museums. Likewise, reunification of the Parthenon Marbles neither establishes a principle for American museums nor poses a threat to our own cultural heritage.

From an ethical point of view, we can imagine the United States position if a foreign diplomat began carting away sculptures from the roof of the Lincoln Monument, which actually the Lincoln Monument was structured after the Parthenon, and they were now in a foreign museum.

From an artistic and cultural point of view, we should consider that the sculptures were integral, structural parts of the architecture, dismembered and taken from the roof of the Parthenon temple. The Parthenon Marbles are not merely "statutory," movable decorative art, but integral, interdependent parts of a temple. Over the centuries, the Parthenon has been a place of worship for three religions in addition to pre-Christian worship of Athena, goddess of wisdom, Orthodox Christian, Catholic, and Muslim.

President Clinton's recent comments in Athens and to British Prime Minister Tony Blair have advanced the debate. Significantly, within days, Prince Charles announced his support for the return of the Marbles to its original place. This will promote a dialogue between the Greek and the British governments which may lead to the reunification of the Marbles to their original home on the Acropolis, hopefully in time to celebrate the 2004 Olympics, which as we know starts in Greece.

Emblems of our culture, in fact, were adopted from the Parthenon and the democracy and culture it represents, including the Lincoln Memorial, the Supreme Court, and innumerable important public buildings and monuments. In the United States, the Committee on the Parthenon has served as a primary catalyst in building public awareness and government support.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that we support this and I have introduced legislation to move it forward.

#### EARTH DAY 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of celebrating the 30th anniversary of Earth Day, which falls on April 22. We have much to celebrate, improved air quality and water quality and other environmental standards and better protections for human health. However, we also still have a long way to go to preserve and protect our natural resources.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has not promoted an environmental agenda in this Congress. This is a shame because, if we continue on the path that the Republican leadership has been advocating, our planet will be in far worse shape 30 years from now.

I just wanted to mention a couple actions that took place just yesterday in the House in the committees that I serve on. For instance, Republicans on the Committee on Resources yesterday promoted efforts to drill the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. If we open the Arctic Refuge to oil and gas development, we will only have the equivalent of 6 more months' worth of oil supply. Yet, in the process, we would destroy one of our Nation's greatest natural resources forever.

Just yesterday, Republicans on the Committee on Commerce in which I serve tried to eliminate water efficiency standards for shower heads and toilets. Fortunately that attempt was defeated. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are already experiencing severe water shortages back home. One study estimated that indoor water use could be reduced by 31 percent per person per day with products that meet the current standards.

Let me just mention also other aspects of the environmental report in general with regard to the Republican majority. I believe very strongly that many of their policies have harmed our domestic and global energy and environmental security by cutting funding for energy efficiency, renewable energy, weatherization, and alternative fuel programs during the last few years.

In their first effort upon taking control of Congress, the Republican majority cut energy efficiency programs by 26 percent. Over the past 5 years, the GOP has slashed funding for solar energy, renewable energy, and conservation programs by nearly \$1.4 billion below the administration's request.

They have also inserted anti-environmental riders into critical funding bills at the 11th hour, hoping that these stealth efforts would not be discovered by the American people. If we look at the situation in Texas where Governor Bush is claiming to be helping the environment, we see that that State ranks first in air pollution in the Nation and third worst in water pollution from chemical dumping. Governor Bush has appointed industry represent-

atives to State environmental agencies that had previously fought against environmental regulations.

□ 2100

And he also has underfunded the cleanup of Superfund sites and has pushed a strictly voluntary program for dirty power plants to reduce harmful emissions, even though Texas's deteriorating air quality has reached a crisis proportion.

While the rest of the world is taking practical steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and save money and energy, the Republican-controlled Congress is lagging behind by debating whether the science is real enough to take similar actions domestically.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Earth Day this year, let us reflect on our responsibility for stewardship of our natural resources. I just hope the Republican leadership will stop trying to gut our environmental laws, and I hope all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in working proactively to protect our environment now for the present and for future generations.

#### SUBMISSION OF AMENDED RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 2000, in accordance with Rule 1(b) of its rules, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct amended its rules as follows: (1) to conform the language of Rule 20(f) to the superseding language of Rule 22(a), the last sentence of Rule 20(f) was deleted, which sentence read "The Committee shall transmit such report to the House of Representatives"; (2) to conform the language of Rule 27(o) to the intention of that rule, the word "of" in the first sentence of Rule 27(o) was deleted and replaced by the word "or." The committee hereby publishes its amended rules in their entirety.

LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman.

HOWARD L. BERMAN,  
Ranking Minority Member.

RULES: COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, ADOPTED JANUARY 20, 1999, AMENDED MARCH 10, 1999, AMENDED APRIL 14, 1999, AMENDED APRIL 12, 2000

#### FOREWORD

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help insure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and